Acyclic Colorings of Directed Graphs

Noah Golowich*

September 29, 2014

arXiv:1409.7535v1 [math.CO] 26 Sep 2014

Abstract

The *acyclic chromatic number* of a directed graph D, denoted $\chi_A(D)$, is the minimum positive integer k such that there exists a decomposition of the vertices of D into k disjoint sets, each of which induces an acyclic subgraph. For any $m \geq 1$, we introduce a generalization of the acyclic chromatic number, namely $\chi_m(D)$, which is the minimum number of sets into which the vertices of a digraph can be partitioned so that each set is weakly m-degenerate. We show that for all digraphs D without directed 2-cycles, $\chi_m(D) \leq \frac{4\bar{\Delta}(D)}{4m+1} + o(\bar{\Delta}(D))$. Because $\chi_1(D) = \chi_A(D)$, we obtain as a corollary that $\chi_A(D) \leq \frac{4}{5} \cdot \bar{\Delta}(D) + o(\bar{\Delta}(D))$, significantly improving a bound of Harutyunyan and Mohar.

1. Introduction

A proper *vertex coloring* of an undirected graph partitions its vertices into independent sets. To extend this notion to directed graphs (digraphs), we consider acyclic sets instead of independent sets. An *acyclic set* in a digraph is a set of vertices whose induced subgraph contains no directed cycle. The *acyclic chromatic number* of a digraph D, denoted $\chi_A(D)$, is then defined to be the minimum number of acyclic sets into which the vertices of D can be partitioned.

Many upper bounds on the chromatic number of undirected graphs are phrased in terms of $\Delta(G)$, the maximum degree of G. To extend this notion to directed graphs, there are a few options which measure the maximum degree. Given a digraph D, $\widetilde{\Delta}(D)$ is the maximum geometric mean of the in-degree and the out-degree of a vertex in D, and $\bar{\Delta}(D)$ is the maximum arithmetic mean of the in-degree and the out-degree of a vertex in D. Notice that if the out-degrees and in-degrees of all vertices in D are equal, then $\widetilde{\Delta}(D) = \bar{\Delta}(D)$.

The acyclic chromatic number $\chi_A(D)$ is one of many chromatic numbers which have been defined for digraphs. Bokal et al. [3] introduced the circular chromatic number of a digraph D, denoted $\chi_c(D)$, as a generalization of the acyclic chromatic number. Let S_p denote the circle with perimeter p, and for $x, y \in S_p$, let $d(x, y)$ denote the clockwise distance from x to y. Then the circular chromatic number $\chi_c(D)$ is the infimum of all positive real numbers p for which there exists a function $c : V(D) \to S_p$ such that for each edge uv of

*Research Science Institute, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge MA.

D, $d(c(u), c(v)) \geq 1$. Bokal et al. showed that $\chi_c(D)$ takes on rational values, and moreover, that $\chi_A(D) - 1 < \chi_c(D) \leq \chi_A(D)$. Chen et al. [10] have also considered defining a digraph coloring simply as a coloring of the underlying undirected graph, and proved bounds on this chromatic number in terms of the lengths modulo k of directed cycles of the digraph.

In this paper, we use the following generalization of the acyclic chromatic number and deduce new bounds on the acyclic chromatic number itself as a special case of our results. For a positive integer m, a digraph D is said to be *weakly m-degenerate* if for every induced subgraph of D, there is a vertex of out-degree or in-degree strictly less than m. Therefore, a digraph is weakly 1-degenerate if and only if it is acyclic. Given a positive integer k, a (k, m)-*degenerate coloring* of D is a partition of $V(D)$ into k sets, each of which is weakly m-degenerate. Given a positive integer m, we denote $\chi_m(D)$, the *m-degenerate chromatic number* of D, as the smallest positive integer k such that D has a (k, m)-degenerate coloring. Notice that $\chi_1(D) = \chi_A(D)$; hence the parameter $\chi_m(D)$ is a generalization of $\chi_A(D)$. Bokal et al. [3] showed some further connections between weak degeneracy and acyclic colorings. For instance, if a digraph is weakly m-degenerate, then $\chi_A(D) \leq m + 1$; moreover, this bound is tight for each positive integer m.

The acyclic chromatic number has received the most attention among digraph chromatic numbers because recent results [1, 3, 15, 12, 2] suggest that the acyclic chromatic number in digraphs behaves similarly to the chromatic number in undirected graphs. Much still remains to be learned however. For instance, it is easily proved using the greedy algorithm that $\chi_A(D) \leq \bar{\Delta}(D) + 1$; this is analogous to the fact that in an undirected graph G, $\chi(G) \leq \Delta(G) + 1$. However, this bound is not tight for most digraphs.

In the case of undirected graphs, Brooks [7] made the first improvement on the obvious bound of $\chi(G) \leq \Delta(G) + 1$; he showed that $\chi(G) \leq \Delta(G)$ unless G is a complete graph or an odd cycle. Borodin and Kostochka [6] and Catlin [9] then independently strengthened Brooks' theorem, showing that if G is K_4-free, then $\chi(G) \leq \left\lceil \frac{3(\Delta(G)+1)}{4} \right\rceil$. Mohar [18] recently proved an analogue of Brooks' theorem for digraphs such that at most one edge connects any pair of vertices; such a digraph is called an *oriented graph*. It follows from Mohar's results that if D is an oriented graph, then $\chi_A(D) \leq \lceil \bar{\Delta}(D) \rceil$ unless D is a directed cycle. However, it appears that this upper bound on $\chi_A(D)$ can be significantly improved further; Harutyunyan and Mohar [12] credit McDiarmid and Mohar with the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.1 (McDiarmid & Mohar, 2002 [12])**.** *Every oriented graph D satisfies $\chi_A(D) = O\left(\frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)}{\log \bar{\Delta}(D)}\right)$.*

Conjecture 1.1 is analogous to a result for undirected graphs by Kim [16], who showed that $\chi(G) \leq (1 + o(1))\frac{\Delta(G)}{\log \Delta(G)}$ if the girth (length of the shortest cycle) of G is greater than 4. Johansson [14] later extended Kim's bound to graphs G of girth greater than 3, and Jamall [13] has since used a simpler proof to strengthen Johansson's bound by a constant factor. Kim, Johansson, and Jamall all used the *pseudo-random method* to prove upper bounds on the chromatic number. The central idea of this method is that given a graph G, and the goal of using $\Delta(G)/k$ colors, where k is a positive integer, the algorithm goes through several rounds and assigns colors randomly to a subset of the uncolored vertices at

each round. Eventually a proper coloring of all the vertices of G will be found with positive probability.

Harutyunyan and Mohar [11] applied the pseudo-random method to digraphs to show that $\chi_A(D) \leq (1 - e^{-13})\widetilde{\Delta}(D)$, which only slightly improves upon the trivial bound of $\chi_A(D) \leq \bar{\Delta}(D) + 1$ and is far from the bound given in Conjecture 1.1. Therefore, Harutyunyan and Mohar [11] posed the following relaxation of Conjecture 1.1.

Conjecture 1.2 (Harutyunyan & Mohar, 2011 [11])**.** *Let D be an oriented graph. Then $\chi_A(D) \leq \left\lceil \frac{\widetilde{\Delta}(D)}{2} \right\rceil + 1$.*

In Theorem 1.3, we prove an upper bound on the m-degenerate chromatic number of any digraph D in terms of $\bar{\Delta}(D)$. It is a special case of Theorem 1.3 that we can significantly improve Harutyunyan and Mohar's bound, thus making progress towards Conjecture 1.2.

Theorem 1.3. *Let m be a positive integer. Suppose we are given an oriented graph D with $\bar{\Delta}(D) \geq 2m$. Then*

$$\chi_m(D) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D) - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)+1/2}{2m+1/2} \right\rfloor}{m} \right\rfloor + 1.$$

By taking $m = 1$, the following corollary follows immediately from Theorem 1.3.

Corollary 1.4. *For an oriented graph D with $\bar{\Delta}(D) \geq 2$, $\chi_A(D) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{4}{5} \cdot \bar{\Delta}(D) + \frac{2}{5} \right\rfloor + 1$.*

We prove Theorem 1.3 by using a strategy similar to one originally introduced by Borodin and Kostochka [5] and by Catlin [9] to prove an upper bound on the chromatic number in undirected graphs. Specifically, we show that the vertices of a directed graph D can be partitioned into several subsets, each inducing a subgraph $D_i \subset D$, such that $\bar{\Delta}(D_i)$ is small. We then use this to show that $\chi_m(D_i)$ is also small, meaning that we can find an upper bound on $\chi_m(D) \leq \sum_i \chi_m(D_i)$.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we prove Theorem 1.3, giving an upper bound on $\chi_m(D)$ for any digraph D in terms of $\bar{\Delta}(D)$. In Section 3, we improve upon this bound for $m = 1$ for a particular class of digraphs. We give some concluding remarks in the final section.

2. Acyclic colorings

Recall that Harutyunyan and Mohar [11] proved that given a digraph D, if $\widetilde{\Delta}(D)$ is large enough, then $\chi_A(D) \leq (1 - e^{-13})\widetilde{\Delta}(D)$. They used a non-constructive method to do so, and posed the problem of improving this bound, remarking that a different technique may be necessary. In this section, we use a constructive technique to prove Theorem 1.3, a specific case of which (Corollary 1.4) is the significantly stronger upper bound of $\chi_A(D) \leq$

$\frac{4}{5} \cdot \bar{\Delta}(D) + o(\bar{\Delta}(D))$. The outline of our proof of Theorem 1.3 is somewhat similar to that of an undirected analogue proved independently by Borodin and Kostochka [6] and Catlin [9].

It is easy to show that $\chi_m(D) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)}{m} \right\rfloor + 1$; the proof is similar to that of the fact that $\chi_A(D) \leq \lfloor \bar{\Delta}(D) \rfloor + 1$. In particular, we color the vertices of D greedily, in any order. At each step, the next vertex v to be colored has either out-degree or in-degree at most $\bar{\Delta}(D)$, suppose without loss of generality out-degree. Therefore, there are at most $\left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)}{m} \right\rfloor$ colors which are represented in at least m out-neighbors of v. We now color v using one of the remaining colors which is represented in less than m out-neighbors of v. The resulting coloring is indeed m-degenerate, since in any subset of any color class, the vertex in that subset colored last must have less than m in-neighbors or out-neighbors in that subset.

Note that Theorem 1.3 gives a significant improvement to $\chi_m(D) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)}{m} \right\rfloor + 1$ for any oriented graph D. To prove Theorem 1.3, we begin by generalizing a directed graph analogue of Brooks' theorem [7] due to Mohar [18] to the framework of m-degenerate colorings. Our proofs follow similar outlines to those of Mohar.

A few definitions are needed to state Lemma 2.1. Given a digraph D and $u \in V(D)$, we denote the subgraph induced on $V(D) \backslash \{u\}$ by $D - u$. Moreover, given a positive integer m, a *critical* vertex is a vertex $v \in V(D)$ such that $\chi_m(D - v) < \chi_m(D)$. If every vertex of D is critical and $\chi_m(D) = k$, then we define D to be a (k, m)-*critical* digraph. Lemma 2.1 shows that critical vertices in a digraph must have large in-degree and out-degree.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose v is a critical vertex in a digraph D, $m \geq 1$, and $\chi_m(D) = k$. Then $d^+(v), d^-(v) \geq (k-1)m$.*

Proof. Suppose for the purpose of contradiction that $d^+(v) < (k-1)m$. We will show that we can find a $(k-1, m)$-degenerate coloring of D, a contradiction to the fact that $\chi_m(D) = k$. Since v is (k, m)-critical, we can find a $(k-1, m)$-degenerate coloring of $D - v$. At least one color class c must be represented in less than m out-neighbors of v because otherwise v would have at least $(k-1)m$ out-neighbors. Now we color v color c, and claim that the subgraph H induced by all vertices of color c is m-degenerate. To see this, let H' be an induced subgraph of H. If $v \in V(H')$, then notice that v has at most $m-1$ out-neighbors in H'. Otherwise, note that H' is a subset of a color class in a $(k-1, m)$-degenerate coloring of $D - v$, meaning that there is some vertex in H' of in-degree or out-degree less than m.

A similar argument shows that $d^-(v) \geq (k-1)m$. □

A digraph is *weakly connected* if the underlying undirected graph is connected. We next state and prove Lemma 2.2, which states that we only need to consider the weakly connected components of a digraph to find its m-degenerate chromatic number.

Lemma 2.2. *If D is a digraph and $D_1, \ldots, D_l$ are its weakly connected components for some positive integer l, then for any $m \geq 1$, $\chi_m(D) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq l} \chi_m(D_i)$.*

Proof. Let $k = \max_{1 \leq i \leq l} \chi_m(D_i)$. We can find a (k, m)-degenerate coloring of each D_i, for $1 \leq i \leq l$, and the resulting composite coloring is a (k, m)-degenerate coloring of D since

there is no edge between any two weakly connected components of D. $\square$

By Lemma 2.2, a digraph D which is (k, m)-critical is also weakly connected.

Lemma 2.3 shows that in a (k, m)-critical oriented graph, we can find a certain set of vertices, which, when removed, does not break the weakly connectedness of the oriented graph.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose $m \geq 1$, $k \geq 3$, and D is a (k, m)-critical oriented graph on n vertices in which each vertex v satisfies $d^+(v) = d^-(v) = (k-1)m$. Then there exists a set of vertices $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{m+1}, u_n \in V(D)$ such that $u_1, \ldots, u_{m+1}$ are all out-neighbors or all in-neighbors of u_n and the digraph induced by $V(D) - \{u_1, \ldots, u_{m+1}\}$ is weakly connected.*

Proof. Pick any $m+1$ vertices $u_1, \ldots, u_{m+1}$ which are all in-neighbors or out-neighbors of another vertex u_n, and let $u_{m+2}, \ldots, u_{n-1}$ be the remaining vertices of D. Let D_0 be the subgraph induced by $\{u_{m+2}, \ldots, u_n\}$. Assume that D_0 is not weakly connected; if it is, the proof is complete.

Let w be any vertex in D_0. Since D is weakly connected, there is some path (not necessarily directed) from w to u_i, for each $1 \leq i \leq m+1$. Therefore, any weakly connected component of D_0 must contain a vertex which is adjacent to some u_i, for $1 \leq i \leq m+1$. Given a weakly connected component C of D_0, let $s(C)$ be the set of all u_i $(1 \leq i \leq m+1)$ which are adjacent to some vertex of C, and let $N(C)$ be the subgraph of D induced by $V(C) \cup s(C)$.

We now perform a multi-step process, considering many possible choices of $u_1, \ldots, u_{m+1}$, u_n until we find one which forces D_0 to be weakly connected. If D_0 is not weakly connected, then choose a weakly connected component C_1, and suppose without loss of generality that $s(C_1) = \{u_1, \ldots, u_h\}$ for some $1 \leq h \leq m+1$. We first mark all vertices of C_1. Let C_2 be another weakly connected component of D_0. We next claim that there is some vertex $v \in V(C_2)$ with at least $m+1$ in-neighbors or $m+1$ out-neighbors in $V(C_2)$. To show this, we must consider two cases:

Case 1. $m \geq 2$ or $k \geq 4$. Notice that each $v \in V(C_2)$ has $(k-1)m$ in-neighbors and $(k-1)m$ out-neighbors, all of which must belong to $V(N(C_2))$ by assumption. Since $m \geq 2$ and $k \geq 4$, we have that $(2k-4)m > m+1 \geq |s(C_2)|$. Therefore, since D is oriented, each $v \in V(C_2)$ must have strictly fewer than $(k-2)m$ in-neighbors or strictly fewer than $(k-2)m$ out-neighbors in $s(C_2)$. Thus v has at least $m+1$ in-neighbors or $m+1$ out-neighbors in $V(C_2)$.

Case 2. $m = 1$ and $k = 3$. In this case, we consider acyclic colorings, and moreover, since each $v \in V(C_2)$ has 2 in-neighbors and 2 out-neighbors, our claim is true unless $|s(C_2)| = 2$ and each $v \in V(C_2)$ has 1 in-neighbor and 1 out-neighbor in $s(C_2)$. Moreover, some vertex of $s(C_2)$ must have an in-neighbor or out-neighbor which does not belong to $V(N(C_2))$; if this were not true, then D would not be weakly connected. Since this vertex has a total of 4 neighbors and must be joined to each vertex of C_2, we have $|V(C_2)| \leq 3$.

We first assume that $|V(C_2)| = 3$, and let $s(C_2) = \{w_1, w_2\}$. Since each vertex of D has 2 in-neighbors and out-neighbors, and since w_1 and w_2 are interchangeable, $N(C_2)$ is



Figure 1: (a) The uncolored digraph $N(C_2)$ when $|V(C_2)| = 3$. (b) An acyclic 2-coloring of $N(C_2)$ when w_1 and w_2 are colored the same color. (c) An acyclic 2-coloring of $N(C_2)$ when w_1 and w_2 are colored different colors.

isomorphic to the digraph shown in Figure 1(a). Moreover, since D is $(3,1)$-critical, we can find an acyclic 2-coloring of $D - V(C_2)$.

If w_1 and w_2 have the same color, suppose red, in this coloring, then suppose without loss of generality that there is no monochromatic directed path from w_1 to w_2 in $D - V(C_2)$. We can make this assumption because the red vertices form an induced acyclic subgraph and since w_1 and w_2 are interchangeable. Next, pick a vertex $x \in V(C_2)$ which has w_1 as its out-neighbor and w_2 as its in-neighbor; there exists such an x since $|V(C_2)| = 3$ and at most 2 vertices in $V(C_2)$ have w_1 as an in-neighbor and w_2 as an out-neighbor. Color vertex x red, and color the other 2 vertices in $V(C_2)$ the other color, suppose blue. As shown in Figure 1(b), this completes an acyclic 2-coloring of D, contradicting its $(3,1)$-criticality.

If w_1 and w_2 have different colors in the acyclic 2-coloring of $D - V(C_2)$, then no monochromatic directed cycle in D can contain a vertex in $V(C_2)$ and a vertex in $D - V(N(C_2))$. Assuming that w_1 is colored red and w_2 is colored blue, we pick 2 vertices of $V(C_2)$, which, when colored red, do not form a monochromatic directed cycle with w_1, and color these vertices red. We color the third vertex of $V(C_2)$ blue. As shown in Figure 1(c), this completes the acyclic 2-coloring of D in this case also, contradicting the $(3,1)$-criticality of D.

In the case that C_2 has 2 or fewer vertices, the proof that we can find an acyclic 2-coloring of D is nearly identical.

Hence we can find a $v \in V(C_2)$ with $m+1$ in-neighbors or $m+1$ out-neighbors in $V(C_2)$. We let $u'_n = v$, and let the $m+1$ in-neighbors or out-neighbors of v in $V(C_2)$ be $u'_1, \ldots, u'_{m+1}$. We finally mark all of $u_1, \ldots, u_h$; notice that the subgraph induced by the marked vertices, namely $N(C_1)$, is weakly connected.

We next repeat the above process with our choice of $u'_1, \ldots, u'_{m+1}, u'_n$. Notice that the marked vertices must all belong to the same weakly connected component of $D'_0 := D - \{u'_1, \ldots, u'_{m+1}\}$, which we call C'_1. We then find a second weakly connected component of D_0, C'_2, and notice that by the same reasoning as above, there is some $v' \in V(C'_2)$ with at least $m+1$ in-neighbors or $m+1$ out-neighbors in C'_2. We let $u''_n = v'$, and let the $m+1$ in-neighbors or out-neighbors of v in C'_2 be $u''_1, \ldots, u''_{m+1}$. We finally mark all vertices of $N(C'_1)$, noting that we mark at least 1 vertex, namely all vertices in $s(C'_1)$, for the first time

and the subgraph induced by the marked vertices, namely $N(C_1')$, is weakly connected.

Since at least 1 new vertex is being marked with each iteration of the process, it must eventually end at some step t. That is, we can eventually find $u_1^{(t)}, \ldots, u_{m+1}^{(t)}, u_n^{(t)}$ so that all vertices in $D_0^{(t)} = D - \{u_1^{(t)}, \ldots, u_{m+1}^{(t)}\}$ are marked, meaning that $D_0^{(t)}$ is weakly connected. This is a contradiction to our original assumption. □

Theorem 2.4 states that the in-degree and out-degree of every vertex cannot be too small in a (k, m)-critical oriented graph.

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose that $m \geq 1$ and D is a (k, m)-critical oriented graph in which each vertex v satisfies $d^+(v) = d^-(v) = (k-1)m$. Then $k \leq 2$.*

Theorem 2.4 is of particular interest since it generalizes the following theorem of Mohar, who proved the case $m = 1$, which is a statement about acyclic colorings.

Theorem 2.5 (Mohar [18])**.** *If D is a $(k, 1)$-critical oriented graph in which each vertex v satisfies $d^+(v) = d^-(v) = k - 1$, then $k \leq 2$.*

We now prove Theorem 2.4, using Lemmas 2.3 and 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. We assume that $k \geq 3$ for the purpose of contradiction and create a linear ordering of the vertices of D, as follows. Pick a u_n and choose $m + 1$ of its out-neighbors (or in-neighbors) $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{m+1}$, so that the digraph $D - \{u_1, \ldots, u_{m+1}\}$ is weakly connected. This construction is possible by Lemma 2.3. Let $D' = D - \{u_1, \ldots, u_{m+1}\}$. Now, since u_n has $(k-1)m$ in-neighbors (or out-neighbors), there is some $u_{n-1} \in D'$ apart from $u_1, u_2, \ldots u_{m+1}$ such that u_n is an out-neighbor or in-neighbor of u_{n-1}. Thus, u_{n-1} has at most $(k-1)m - 1$ out-neighbors (or in-neighbors) in $D' - u_n$. Now continue in a similar manner, using the weakly connectedness of D' to find $\{u_{m+2}, \ldots, u_{n-1}\}$ such that each of these vertices v_i $(m + 2 \leq i \leq n - 1)$ has out-degree or in-degree less than $(k-1)m$ in $D - \{u_{i+1}, \ldots, u_n\}$.

We now color the vertices of D as follows: we give $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{m+1}$ the same color; at this point, the coloring of $\{u_1, \ldots, u_{m+1}\}$ is $(k-1, m)$-degenerate since each vertex among $u_1, \ldots, u_{m+1}$ has less than m in-neighbors or out-neighbors. Then for $m+2 \leq i \leq n-1$, we start with a $(k-1, m)$-degenerate coloring of $\{u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}\}$ and extend this coloring to u_i. This is possible since in the subgraph of D induced by $\{u_1, \ldots, u_i\}$, u_i has in-degree or out-degree less than $(k-1)m$. Therefore, in the $(k-1, m)$-degenerate coloring of $\{u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}\}$, one of the color classes contains fewer than m in-neighbors or out-neighbors of u_i. We finally extend the $(k-1, m)$-degenerate coloring of $\{u_1, \ldots, u_{n-1}\}$ to u_n. This is possible since u_n has $m+1$ in-neighbors or out-neighbors, namely $u_1, \ldots, u_{m+1}$, of the same color, but exactly $(k-1)m$ in-neighbors and out-neighbors in total, so we can find a color represented among fewer than m in-neighbors or out-neighbors of u_n, and color u_n this color.

At the end of the process, we claim that each color class c is m-degenerate. To show this, for any color class c and subset S of the vertices colored c, pick $u_i \in S$ so that i is as large as possible. Then since u_i is the vertex in S that was colored last, u_i has at most $m - 1$ in-neighbors or out-neighbors in S, completing the proof. □

Lemma 2.6 uses Lemma 2.1 to extend Theorem 2.4 to digraphs that are not (k, m)-critical. Intuitively, this is possible because (k, m)-critical digraphs are the worst case for finding an m-degenerate coloring with few colors.

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose that $m \geq 1$, $\chi_m(D) = k + 1$, for some integer $k \geq 2$, and that D is an oriented graph. Then $\bar{\Delta}(D) > km$.*

Proof. Fix $m \geq 1$. Suppose for the purpose of contradiction that for some $k \geq 2$, there is an oriented graph D with as few vertices as possible, such that $\chi_m(D) = k + 1$ and $\bar{\Delta}(D) \leq km$. Notice that if D were not $(k + 1, m)$-critical, we could remove some vertex v to form $D' = D - v$, and we would have $\chi_m(D') = k + 1$ and $\bar{\Delta}(D') \leq \bar{\Delta}(D) \leq km$. This contradicts the fact that D has as few vertices as possible such that $\bar{\Delta}(D) \leq km$ holds. Hence D is $(k + 1, m)$-critical.

By Lemma 2.1, for each $v \in V(D)$, we have that $d^+(v) \geq km$ and $d^-(v) \geq km$. In order to have $\bar{\Delta}(D) \leq km$, we must have $d^+(v) = d^-(v) = km$ for all $v \in V(D)$. But then by Theorem 2.4, we have that $k + 1 \leq 2$, contradicting the fact that $k + 1 \geq 3$. □

The following corollary follows from Lemma 2.6. It is a directed analogue of a theorem of Borodin [4].

Corollary 2.7. *If D is an oriented graph such that $\bar{\Delta}(D) \geq 2m$, then $\chi_m(D) \leq \left\lceil \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)}{m} \right\rceil$.*

Proof. Let $k = \left\lceil \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)}{m} \right\rceil$. Then $k \geq 2$. If $\chi_m(D) \geq k + 1$, then by Lemma 2.6, $\bar{\Delta}(D) > km$, meaning that $\frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)}{m} > k$, so it is impossible that $k = \left\lceil \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)}{m} \right\rceil$. □

To prove Theorem 1.3, we also use a theorem of Lovász [17], which states that the vertices of a graph can be decomposed into sets so that the sum of the maximal degrees of all the sets is less than the maximal degree of the graph.

Theorem 2.8 (Lovász [17])**.** *For an undirected graph G, suppose that for some $s \geq 1$ and positive integers $\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_s$, we have $\Delta(G) = (s - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{s} \Delta_i$. Then there is a covering of $V(G)$ with s subgraphs G_i $(1 \leq i \leq s)$, so that $\Delta(G_i) \leq \Delta_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$.*

We deduce as a corollary of Theorem 2.8 a version for directed graphs.

Corollary 2.9. *Given a digraph D, $s \geq 1$, and rational numbers $\bar{\Delta}_1, \ldots, \bar{\Delta}_s \geq 1$ so that for $1 \leq i \leq s$, $2\bar{\Delta}_i$ is an integer, suppose $\bar{\Delta}(D) = \frac{s-1}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^{s} \bar{\Delta}_i$. Then there is a covering of $V(D)$ with s subgraphs D_i $(1 \leq i \leq s)$ such that $\bar{\Delta}(D_i) \leq \bar{\Delta}_i$.*

Proof. Given a digraph D, consider the underlying undirected graph G. Notice that $\Delta(G) = 2\bar{\Delta}(D)$. By Theorem 2.8, we can partition G into vertex-disjoint subgraphs $G_1, \ldots, G_s$, so that the maximum total degree in G_i is at most $2\bar{\Delta}_i$. For $1 \leq i \leq s$, we let D_i be the directed subgraph of D induced by $V(G_i)$. Thus, for $1 \leq i \leq s$, $\bar{\Delta}(D_i) \leq \bar{\Delta}_i$. □

We now prove Theorem 1.3, using Lemma 2.6 and Corollary 2.9 to find an upper bound on $\chi_m(D)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Set

$$s = \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D) + 1/2}{2m + 1/2} \right\rfloor, \quad r = \bar{\Delta}(D) + 1/2 - s(2m + 1/2).$$

Then $\bar{\Delta}(D) = \frac{s}{2} + (\sum_{i=1}^{s} 2m) + (r - \frac{1}{2})$, meaning that, by Corollary 2.9, the vertices of D can be covered with $s + 1$ subgraphs $D_1, \ldots, D_{s+1}$, which satisfy:

$$\bar{\Delta}(D_i) \leq \begin{cases} 2m & \text{if} \quad 1 \leq i \leq s \\ r - \frac{1}{2} & \text{if} \quad i = s + 1. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 2.6, if $\chi_m(D_i) \geq 3$, then we would have that $\bar{\Delta}(D_i) > 2m$. Moreover, recalling the trivial bound that $\chi_m(D) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)}{m} \right\rfloor + 1$, we have

$$\chi_m(D_i) \leq \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if} \quad 1 \leq i \leq s \\ 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{(r-1/2)}{m} \right\rfloor & \text{if} \quad i = s + 1. \end{cases}$$

We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_m(D) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{s+1} \chi_m(D_i) \\ &\leq 2s + \lfloor (r - 1/2)/m \rfloor + 1 \\ &= 2 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta} + 1/2}{2m + 1/2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D) - (2m + 1/2) \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta} + 1/2}{2m + 1/2} \right\rfloor}{m} \right\rfloor + 1 \\ &= \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)}{m} - \left(\frac{2m + 1/2}{m} - 2 \right) \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta} + 1/2}{2m + 1/2} \right\rfloor \right\rfloor + 1 \\ &= \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D) - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D) + 1/2}{2m + 1/2} \right\rfloor}{m} \right\rfloor + 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

3. Better bounds for $m = 1$ with improved decomposition lemma

In this section, we show that the bounds in Theorem 2.8 can be improved for any digraph which does not contain any of the graphs shown in Figure 2 as an induced subgraph. This leads to improvements to the bounds in Theorem 1.3 in the case $m = 1$ for these classes of digraphs. We first introduce some notation. Given disjoint sets of vertices V_1 and V_2 which



Figure 2: The digraphs F_1, F_2, G_1, and G_2.

belong to a digraph D, we let $E(V_1, V_2)$ be the set of all edges which point from a vertex in V_1 to a vertex in V_2. Moreover, we define $e(V_1, V_2) = |E(V_1, V_2)|$. Finally, given a vertex u, we define $d^+_{V_1}(u)$ as the number of out-neighbors of u in V_1, $d^-_{V_1}(u)$ as the number of in-neighbors of u in V_1, and $\bar{d}_{V_1}(u) = \frac{d^+_{V_1}(u)+d^-_{V_1}(u)}{2}$.

We let F_1, F_2, G_1, and G_2 be the 4-vertex digraphs shown in Figure 2. For simplicity, we say that D *avoids* F if D contains neither F_1 nor F_2 as an induced subgraph and that D *avoids* G is D contains neither G_1 not G_2 as an induced subgraph.

Notice that in Theorem 1.3 for the case $m = 1$, we set most of the $\bar{\Delta}_i$ to 2 because it is not true that if $\bar{\Delta}(D_i) \leq 1$, then $\chi_A(D_i) = 1$. The following Lemma 3.1 shows that if D avoids F and G, then we can partition D into vertex-disjoint subgraphs $D_1, \ldots, D_s$, so that for all i where $\bar{\Delta}_i = 1$, D_i does not contain an induced cycle, and therefore $\chi_A(D_i) = 1$. Notice that if the shortest directed cycle in D is of length at least 4, then the constraint is relaxed to the condition that D avoids F. The proof is similar to that of an undirected analogue proved by Catlin [8].

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose we are given a digraph D, and positive integers $s, \bar{\Delta}_1, \ldots, \bar{\Delta}_s$. If $\bar{\Delta}(D) = (s-2)/2 + \sum_{i=1}^{s} \bar{\Delta}_i$ and D avoids F and G, then there is a partition of $V(D)$ into s subgraphs D_i $(1 \leq i \leq s)$ so that $\chi_A(D_i) \leq \bar{\Delta}_i$.*

Proof. Given a partition of $V(D)$ into s subsets $V_1, \ldots, V_s$, define

$$f(V_1, \ldots, V_2) = \bar{\Delta}_1|V_1| + \bar{\Delta}_2|V_2| + \cdots + \bar{\Delta}_s|V_s| + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq s} \frac{e(V_i, V_j) + e(V_j, V_i)}{2}.$$

We let A be the set of all i such that $\bar{\Delta}_i = 1$. Notice that if $i \in A$, then any directed cycle in V_i must be both induced and a component of the subgraph induced by V_i. Following notation of Catlin [8], we call any such directed cycle a *Brooks cycle*. Now, choose a partition of the vertices of D into subsets $V_1, \ldots, V_s$ so that, (i), $f(V_1, \ldots, V_s)$ is maximized, and (ii), the number of Brooks cycles is minimized, subject to (i).

We first claim that any partition which maximizes f has $\bar{\Delta}(D_i) \leq \bar{\Delta}_i$ for all i. Notice that for any $u \in V_1$, and for $2 \leq j \leq s$, we have

$$f(V_1, \ldots, V_s) - f(V_1 - u, V_2, \ldots, V_j + u, \ldots, v_s) \geq 0,$$

by maximality of f. But

$$\begin{aligned} & f(V_1,\ldots,V_s) - f(V_1-u, V_2,\ldots,V_j+u\ldots,v_s) \qquad (1)\\ = \;& \frac{e(V_1,V_j)+e(V_j,V_1)-(e(V_1-u,V_j+u)+e(V_j+u,V_1-u))}{2} + \bar{\Delta}_1 - \bar{\Delta}_j \\ = \;& \frac{d^+_{V_j}(u)-d^-_{V_1}(u)}{2} + \frac{d^-_{V_j}(u)-d^+_{V_1}(u)}{2} + \bar{\Delta}_1 - \bar{\Delta}_j \\ = \;& \bar{d}_{V_j}(u) - \bar{d}_{V_1}(u) + \bar{\Delta}_1 - \bar{\Delta}_j. \qquad (2)\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for $1 \le j \le s$, we have

$$\bar{d}_{V_1}(u) \le \bar{\Delta}_1 - \bar{\Delta}_j + \bar{d}_{V_j}(u). \qquad (3)$$

By averaging (3) over all choices of j, $1 \le j \le s$, we obtain

$$\bar{d}_{V_1}(u) \le \bar{\Delta}_1 - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^s \bar{\Delta}_j}{s} + \frac{\bar{d}_G(u)}{s} = \bar{\Delta}_1 - \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)-(s-2)/2}{s} + \frac{\bar{d}_G(u)}{s}.$$

But $\bar{d}_G(u) \le \bar{\Delta}(D)$, so

$$\bar{d}_{V_1}(u) \le \bar{\Delta}_1 + \frac{s-2}{2s}.$$

Since $2\bar{\Delta}_1$ and $2\bar{d}_{V_1}(u)$ are integers, we must have that $\bar{d}_{V_1}(u) \le \bar{\Delta}_1$. Since u can be any vertex in V_1, we have $\bar{\Delta}(D_1) \le \bar{\Delta}_1$. Moreover, we can repeat the above process with V_1 replaced by V_i, for $2 \le i \le s$, and we have that $\bar{\Delta}(D_i) \le \bar{\Delta}_i$.

Therefore, if $\bar{\Delta}_i \ge 2$, that is, if $i \notin A$, then by Lemma 2.6, we have that $\chi_A(D_i) \le \bar{\Delta}(D_i) \le \bar{\Delta}_i$. We now claim that since the partition $V_1,\ldots,V_s$ minimizes the total number of Brooks cycles subject to the fact that $f(V_1,\ldots,V_s)$ is maximized, the total number of Brooks cycles is 0. For the purpose of contradiction, suppose there is some Brooks cycle $C_0 \subset V_i$ where $i \in A$, and let $v_0 \in V(C_0)$. If $\bar{d}_{V_j}(v_0) \ge \bar{\Delta}_j + \frac{1}{2}$ for each $j \ne i$, then since $\bar{d}_{V_i}(v_0) = \bar{\Delta}_i = 1$,

$$\bar{d}(v_0) \ge \bar{\Delta}_i + \sum_{j\ne i}\left(\bar{\Delta}_j + \frac{1}{2}\right) = \bar{\Delta}(D) + \frac{1}{2} > \bar{\Delta}(D),$$

which is impossible. Hence there is some $j \ne i$ so that $\bar{d}_{V_j}(v_0) \le \bar{\Delta}_j$. Thus, noting that $\bar{d}_{V_i}(u) = \bar{\Delta}_i$, and by equality of (1) with (2), moving v_0 from V_i to V_j does not decrease $f(V_1,\ldots,V_s)$. Moreover, since moving v_0 removes a Brooks cycle from V_i, it must create a Brooks cycle C_1 in V_j. Therefore, by our definition of Brooks cycle, $\bar{\Delta}_j = 1$, so $j \in A$. We then pick $v_1 \ne v_0$ such that $v_1 \in V(C_1)$, and repeat the process.

Eventually, since the total number of vertices is finite, there must be some V_i so that the process generates an infinite sequence of Brooks cycles in V_i, which we call $C'_1, C'_2, \ldots$. Since each of the steps in our process moves only a single vertex, we must be able to find Brooks cycles C'_p and C'_q that differ in only one vertex. Specifically, suppose that $a \ge 2$ and the vertices of C'_p are $x_1,\ldots,x_a,x_p$ while the vertices of C'_q are $x_1,\ldots,x_a,x_q$.

If $a = 2$, then the vertices x_1, x_a, x_p, and x_q form an induced subgraph isomorphic to either G_1 or G_2, depending on whether there is an edge between x_p and x_q. If $a \geq 3$, then since C'_p and C'_q are induced, there is no edge between x_a and x_1, meaning that the vertices x_1, x_a, x_p, and x_q form an induced subgraph isomorphic to either F_1 or F_2. In either case, we have a contradiction to the fact that D is F-free and G-free.

Thus there are no Brooks cycles, meaning that for $i \in A$, D_i is acyclic, so $\chi_A(D_i) = 1 = \bar{\Delta}_i$ for all $i \in A$. □

Our main theorem of this section improves the bound of $\chi_A(D) \leq \frac{4}{5} \cdot \bar{\Delta}(D) + o(\bar{\Delta}(D))$ in Corollary 1.4 to $\chi_A(D) \leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot \bar{\Delta}(D) + o(\bar{\Delta}(D)$ for oriented graphs D which avoid F and G.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose D is an oriented graph which avoids F and G. Then*

$$\chi_A(D) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3} \cdot \bar{\Delta}(D) + 1/2 \right\rfloor + 1.$$

Proof. Set

$$s = \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D) + 1}{3/2} \right\rfloor, \quad r = \bar{\Delta}(D) + 1 - 3/2s.$$

Then $\bar{\Delta}(D) = (r-1) + \frac{s}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^{s} 1$, meaning that, by Lemma 3.1, the vertices of D can be covered with $s+1$ subgraphs $D_1, \ldots, D_{s+1}$, which satisfy:

$$\chi_A(D_i) \leq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad 1 \leq i \leq s \\ \lfloor r - \frac{1}{2} \rfloor + 1 & \text{if} \quad i = s+1. \end{cases}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_A(D) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{s+1} \chi_A(D_i) \\ &\leq s + \lfloor \bar{\Delta}(D) + 1/2 - 3/2s \rfloor + 1 \\ &= \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)+1}{3/2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \bar{\Delta}(D) + 1/2 - 3/2 \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)+1}{3/2} \right\rfloor \right\rfloor + 1 \\ &= \left\lfloor \bar{\Delta}(D) + 1/2 - 1/2 \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Delta}(D)+1}{3/2} \right\rfloor \right\rfloor + 1 \\ &\leq \lfloor 2/3 \cdot \bar{\Delta}(D) + 1/2 \rfloor + 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

4. Concluding remarks

In this paper, we have proved an upper bound on a generalization of the acyclic chromatic number, the m-degenerate chromatic number. Moreover, the special case of $m = 1$ gives a bound on the acyclic number which significantly improves current bounds. However, the

bound in Theorem 1.3 differs from the conjectured bound in Conjectures 1.1 by a factor of $\log \bar{\Delta}(D)$. It seems that a new technique is necessary to obtain the additional factor of $\log \bar{\Delta}(D)$, if it is indeed correct. Moreover, it seems that Conjecture 1.1 can be extended to the m-degenerate chromatic number.

Conjecture 4.1. *If m is a positive integer and c is a constant which does not depend on m, then every oriented graph D has $\chi_m(D) \leq (c + o(1)) \frac{(\bar{\Delta}(D)/m)}{\log(\bar{\Delta}(D)/m)}$.*

We finally note that the bounds obtained in this paper were all phrased in terms of $\bar{\Delta}(D)$. By the arithmetic mean - geometric mean inequality, for any digraph D, we have $\widetilde{\Delta}(D) \leq \bar{\Delta}(D)$, meaning that bounds phrased in terms of $\widetilde{\Delta}(D)$ would be slightly stronger. It does not seem that our methods can produce bounds which would hold with $\bar{\Delta}(D)$ replaced by $\widetilde{\Delta}(D)$. However, most graphs which are interesting for the problem of acyclic chromatic number have the in-degree and out-degree of the vertices approximately equal, meaning that $\bar{\Delta}(D) \approx \widetilde{\Delta}(D)$.

5. Acknowledgements

I would like to thank David Rolnick for his helpful discussions and review of the paper. I would also like to thank Jacob Fox for suggesting the direction of research and Tanya Khovanova for helpful suggestions and review. I thank Pavel Etingof, David Jerison, and Slava Gerovitch for coordinating the research, and John Rickert for helpful review. Finally I would like to thank the Center for Excellence in Education, the Research Science Institute, and the MIT Math Department for their support.

References

[1] Ron Aharoni, Eli Berger, and Ori Kfir. Acyclic systems of representatives and acyclic colorings of digraphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, pages 177–189, 2008.

[2] Ido Ben-Eliezer, Michael Krivelevich, and Benny Sudakov. The size Ramsey number of a directed path. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 102: 743–755, 2012.

[3] Drago Bokal, Gasper Fijavž, Martin Juvan, P. Mark Kayll, and Bojan Mohar. The circular chromatic number of a digraph. *Journal of Graph Theory*, pages 227–240, 2004.

[4] Oleg Borodin. On decomposition of graphs into degenerated subgraphs. *Diskretnyj Analiz*, 28, 1976.

[5] Oleg Borodin. On acyclic colorings of planar graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 25: 211–236, 1979.

[6] Oleg Borodin and Alexandr Kostochka. On an upper bound of a graph's chromatic number, depending on the graph's degree and density. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 23: 247–250, 1977.

[7] Rowland Brooks. On coloring the nodes of a network. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 37: 194–197, 1941.

[8] Paul Catlin. Another bound on the chromatic number of a graph. *Discrete Mathematics*, 24: 1–6, 1978.

[9] Paul Catlin. A bound on the chromatic number of a graph. *Discrete Mathematics*, 22: 81–83, 1978.

[10] Zhibin Chen, Jie Ma, and Wenan Zang. Coloring digraphs with forbidden cycles. *arXiv*, 1403.8127, 2014.

[11] Ararat Harutyunyan and Bojan Mohar. Strengthened Brooks' theorem for digraphs of girth at least three. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 18: P195, 2011.

[12] Ararat Harutyunyan and Bojan Mohar. Two results on the digraph chromatic number. *Discrete Mathematics*, 312(10): 1823–1826, 2012.

[13] Mohammad Shoaib Jamall. A Brooks' theorem for triangle-free graphs. *arXiv*, 1106.1958, 2011.

[14] A. Johannson. Asymptotic choice number for triangle free graphs. *Unpublished*.

[15] Peter Keevash, Zhentao Li, Bojan Mohar, and Bruce Reed. Digraph girth via chromatic number. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 27(2): 693–696, 2013.

[16] Jeong Han Kim. On Brooks' theorem for sparse graphs. *Combinatorics, Probability, and Computing*, 4(2): 97–132, 1995.

[17] László Lovász. On decomposition of graphs. *Studia Scientiarum Mathematicarum Hungarica*, 1: 237–238, 1966.

[18] Bojan Mohar. Eigenvalues and colorings of digraphs. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 432: 2273–2277, 2010.